Probing the distance-duality relation with high-z data

R. F. L. Holanda[1,2,3],* V. C. Busti[4],† F. S. Lima[2],‡ and J. S. Alcaniz[5]§
[1]*Departamento de Física, Universidade Estadual da Paraíba, 58429-500, Campina Grande - PB, Brasil*
[2]*Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal de Campina Grande, 58429-900, Campina Grande - PB, Brasil*
[3]*Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, 59078-970, Natal - RN, Brasil*
[4]*Departamento de Física Matemática, Instituto de Física, Universidade de São Paulo, CEP 05508-090, São Paulo - SP, Brasil and*
[5]*Observatório Nacional, 20921-400, Rio de Janeiro - RJ, Brasil*

(Dated: November 30, 2016)

Measurements of strong gravitational lensing jointly with type Ia supernovae (SNe Ia) observations have been used to test the validity of the cosmic distance duality relation (CDDR), $D_L(z)/[(1+z)^2 D_A(z)] = \eta = 1$, where $D_L(z)$ and $D_A(z)$ are the luminosity and the angular diameter distances at a given redshift z. However, most of these lensing systems lie beyond the redshift range of current SNe Ia data, which prevents this kind of test to be fully explored. In this paper, we circumvent this problem by testing the CDDR considering observations of strong gravitational lensing along with SNe Ia and the latest gamma-ray burst distance modulus data, whose redshift range is $0.033 < z < 9.3$. We consider different $\eta(z)$ functions and obtain that the CDDR validity ($\eta_0 = 0$) is verified within 1.5σ when a power law is used to describe the mass distribution in the lensing systems.

arXiv:1611.09426v1 [astro-ph.CO] 28 Nov 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, several authors have proposed methods to test the so-called cosmic distance duality relation (CDDR), which is derived from Etherington reciprocity theorem [1]. In the astronomical framework, considering that photons number is conserved over the cosmic evolution and that they follow null (unique) geodesics, the CDDR is expressed as

$$\frac{D_L(z)}{D_A(z)(1+z)^2} = \eta = 1\ , \tag{1}$$

where D_L and D_A are the luminosity and angular diameter distances in a given redshift, z, respectively. The CDDR plays an essential role in observational cosmology and any departure from it could point to exciting new fundamental physics, such as, photon coupling with particles beyond the standard model of particle physics, variation of fundamental constants, absorption by dust or unaccounted systematic errors (for a detailed discussion, see [2] and [3]). Nowadays, the results from different methods, involving luminosity distances of type Ia supernovae, angular diameter distances of galaxy clusters, gas mass fractions of galaxy clusters, the blackness of the cosmic microwave background and gamma-ray bursts, have been consistent with the validity of the CDDR at least within 2σ level [4]. However, new methods with different astronomical observations and redshift range offer a path to validate the whole cosmological framework as well as to detect unexpected behavior or systematic errors. Very recently, observations of strong gravitational lenses systems were used to perform tests of the CDDR [5, 6]. In this paper we explore further possible constraints on the CDDR with this kind of observation.

Strong gravitational lens is an important effect arising from Einstein's theory of general relativity which has played a very important role as a probe of the nature of dark matter in the universe as well as in tests of cosmological models [7]. A known quantity is the Einstein radius, which varies with cosmological models via the ratio of the angular diameter distances between lens/source and observer/source. Basically, it occurs when the source (s), the lens (l) and the observer (o) are well aligned with the observer-source direction [8]. The Einstein radius θ_E, under the simplest assumption describing the mass distribution in lenses, the singular isothermal sphere (SIS), is given by

$$\theta_E = 4\pi \frac{D_{A_{ls}}}{D_{A_s}} \frac{\sigma_{SIS}^2}{c^2}, \tag{2}$$

where c is the speed of light, $D_{A_{ls}}$ and D_{A_s} are the angular diameter distances between lens-source and source-observer, respectively, and σ_{SIS} is the velocity dispersion due to lens mass distribution.

Briefly, by changing the ratio between angular diameter distances by a between luminosity distances via a deformed CDDR, $D_L D_A^{-1}(1+z)^{-2} = \eta(z)$, it is possible to perform constraints on $\eta(z)$ functions (see next section for details). For instance, by considering $\eta(z) = 1+\eta_0 z/(1+z)$, the authors of [5] used 95 data points from 118 strong gravitational lensing (SGL) systems obtained by [9], 580 type Ia supernovae (SNe Ia) from Union2.1 [10], the latest results from *Planck* collaboration [11] and WMAP9 satellite [12] to put limits on η_0. In [6] was proposed a cosmological-model independent test (only a flat universe was assumed) by assuming $\eta(z) = 1+\eta_0 z$ and using 60 SGL-SNe Ia pairs from [13] and [9]. The results from both works confirmed the validity of the CDDR ($\eta_0 \approx 0$ into 1 σ c.l.).

*Electronic address: holanda@uepb.edu.br
†Electronic address: viniciusbusti@gmail.com
‡Electronic address: limasdl@bol.com.br
§Electronic address: alcaniz@on.br

However, the sample from [9] has SGL systems that reach z up to 3.5 and, consequently, a basic limitation of the analyses quoted above is the impossibility of using the entire SGL sample. The reason is very simple: to perform the test it is necessary to find SNe Ia and SGL systems at identical redshifts, but several lenses of the SGL data lie at $z > 1.50$, which is the maximum redshift of the SNe Ia in the Union2.1 compilation. Therefore, several SGL systems were excluded in the previous analyses. On the other hand, since one of the main goal of this kind of analysis is to test the validity of the CDDR at different regimes, reaching higher redshifts is of fundamental importance to put limits on a possible $\eta(z)$ evolution.

In this paper, based on the method proposed by [6], we test the CDDR validity up to high redshifts by using all the 118 SGL systems from [9], SNe Ia from the Union2.1 compilation and the latest gamma-ray burst distance module data [14]. Gamma-ray bursts (GRB's) are the most energetic explosions in the Universe being detectable up to very high redshifts. The new data corresponds to 162 points in the redshift range $0.033 < z < 9.3$, therefore, beyond the SNe Ia redshifts. In this way, we added to the SNe Ia Union2.1 data all gamma-ray bursts with $z > 1.42$, the limit redshift of the SNe Ia sample, resulting in 677 luminosity distances. From the theoretical viewpoint, we consider two $\eta(z)$ functions, namely, $\eta(z) = 1 + \eta_0 z$ (P1) and $\eta(z) = 1 + \eta_0 z/(1+z)$ (P2) [15].

This paper is organized as follows: Section II briefly revises the method proposed by Ref. [6]. In Section III we present the samples used in the analysis. In Section IV we show and discuss the main results of this paper. We summarize the results of this work in Section V.

II. METHOD

The method to test the CDDR validity proposed by [6] uses SGL systems and SNe Ia observations and does not depend on assumptions concerning the details of cosmological model; only a flat universe is assumed.

Firstly, let us consider Eq. (2) and define the observational quantity:

$$D = \frac{D_{A_{ls}}}{D_{A_s}} = \frac{\theta_E c^2}{4\pi\sigma^2_{SIS}}. \tag{3}$$

On the other hand, in a flat universe, the comoving distance r_{ls} is given by [16]

$$r_{ls} = r_s - r_l. \tag{4}$$

Now, using $r_s = (1+z_s)D_{A_s}$, $r_l = (1+z_l)D_{A_l}$ and $r_{ls} = (1+z_s)D_{A_{ls}}$, we find

$$D = 1 - \frac{(1+z_l)D_{A_l}}{(1+z_s)D_{A_s}}. \tag{5}$$

Finally, using the deformed CDDR, such as, $D_L D_A^{-1}(1+z)^{-2} = \eta(z)$, the above expression can be written as

$$\frac{(1+z_s)\eta(z_s)}{(1+z_l)\eta(z_l)} = (1-D)\frac{D_{L_s}}{D_{L_l}}. \tag{6}$$



Figure 1: The luminosity distances from the 580 SNe Ia (filled red circles) and 97 gamma ray burst data (open black circles). The solid and dashed black lines are the polynomial fit and the 1σ error from our fit, respectively.

Then, with SGL measurements and the luminosity distances to the lens and source of each system known, it is possible to study the evolution of the $\eta(z)$ function and test the CDDR.

III. SAMPLES

In our work, we use the following data sets:

- 118 SGL systems from Ref. [9]. These systems were observed in Sloan Lens ACS survey (SLACS), BOSS Emission-Line Lens Survey (BELLS), Lenses Structure and Dynamics Survey (LSD) and Strong Legacy Survey SL2S surveys with redshift ranges: $0.075 \leq z_l \leq 1.004$ and $0.20 \leq z_s \leq 3.60$. We consider the two approaches of [9] to describe the lensing systems: the SIS model where a spherically symmetric mass distribution in lensing galaxies is also assumed. But the rigid assumption of the SIS model was relaxed in favor of a more general power-law index γ, $\rho \propto r^{-\gamma}$ (PLaw model). This kind of model is important since several studies have shown that slopes of density profiles of individual galaxies show a non-negligible scatter from the SIS [17]. Under this assumption the Einstein radius is:

$$\theta_E = 4\pi\frac{\sigma^2_{ap}}{c^2}\frac{D_{ls}}{D_s}\left(\frac{\theta_E}{\theta_{ap}}\right)^{2-\gamma} f(\gamma), \tag{7}$$

where σ_{ap} is the stellar velocity dispersion inside the aperture of size θ_{ap} and

$$f(\gamma) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\frac{(5-2\gamma)(1-\gamma)}{3-\gamma}\frac{\Gamma(\gamma-1)}{\Gamma(\gamma-3/2)} \times \left[\frac{\Gamma(\gamma/2-1/2)}{\Gamma(\gamma/2)}\right]^2. \tag{8}$$



Figure 2: In fig.(a) we plot the analysis for P1 function. In fig.(b) we plot the analysis for P2 function.

Therefore:

$$D = D_{A_{ls}}/D_{A_s} = \frac{c^2\theta_E}{4\pi\sigma_{ap}^2}\left(\frac{\theta_{ap}}{\theta_E}\right)^{2-\gamma} f^{-1}(\gamma). \quad (9)$$

The distribution becomes a SIS for $\gamma = 2$. In Table 1 of [9] is displayed all relevant information necessary to obtain D in Eq.(7) for both models and perform our fit. It is important to stress that the σ_{SIS} in Eq.(3) is not to be exactly equal to the observed stellar velocity dispersion σ_0 since there is a strong indication that dark matter halos are dynamically hotter than the luminous stars based on X-ray observations. In order to account for this difference it is introduced a phenomenological free parameter f_e, defined by the relation: $\sigma_{SIS} = f_e\sigma_0$, where $(0.8)^{1/2} < f_e < (1.2)^{1/2}$ [18]. When the PLaw model is considered we perform our analysis by using a flat prior on γ: $1.15 < \gamma < 3.5$. Also following these authors, we replace σ_{ap} by σ_0 in the PLaw model.

- The full SNe Ia sample compiled by Suzuki et al. (2012) [10], the so-called Union2.1 compilation, see Fig.(1). This sample comprises 580 data points in the redshift range $0.015 \leq z \leq 1.42$.

- GRB distance moduli, $\mu(z)$, from Demianski et al. (2016) [14]. The original data set has 167 GRB's in the redshift range $0.033 < z < 9.3$ (see Fig. 1). It is worth mentioning that, although details of the physical mechanism behind GRB explosions are not completely known yet, an important observational aspect of long GRB's are the several correlations between spectral and intensity properties, which suggest that GRB's can be used as distance indicators. The authors of [14] used a local regression technique jointly with SNe Ia luminosity distances (Union2.1 compilation) to calibrate these correlations. A possible redshift dependence of the correlation and its effect on the GRB Hubble diagram were tested and no significant redshift dependence was found.

Finally, we added to SNe Ia data 97 GRB with z's higher than 1.42. We obtain the luminosity distance, D_L, to each SNe Ia and GRB from: $D_L(z) = 10^{(\mu(z)-25)/5}$ Mpc and $\sigma^2_{D_L} = (\frac{\partial D_L}{\partial \mu})^2\sigma^2_\mu$. Then, we parameterize their luminosity distances with a second degree polynomial function[1], such as: $D_L(z) = Az + Bz^2$ (in Mpc), with $A = 4581.65$, $B = 1228.73$, $\sigma_A = 28.26$, $\sigma_B = 66.83$ and $COV(A,B) = -1296.60$, with $\chi^2_{red} = 1.16$ (see Fig. 1). Following [10], we added a 0.15 systematic error to SNe Ia data. Therefore, due to high $z's$ of the GRB, the $D_L(z)$ function can provide the luminosity distances to the lens and source of each SGL system in [9].

IV. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The constraints on the η_0 parameter are derived by evaluating the likelihood distribution function, $\mathcal{L} \propto e^{-\chi^2/2}$, with

$$\chi^2 = \sum_i^{118} \frac{\left[\frac{(1+z_{s_i})\eta(z_{s_i})}{(1+z_{l_i})\eta(z_{l_i})} - (1-D_i)\frac{D_{L_{s_i}}}{D_{L_{l_i}}}\right]^2}{\sigma_i^2} \quad (10)$$

where $\eta(z) = 1 + \eta_0 z$ (P1) and $\eta(z) = 1 + \eta_0 z/(1+z)$ (P2), σ_i^2 stands for the statistical errors associated to the $D_L(z)$ function of the SNe Ia, GRB's, the gravitational lensing observations and it is obtained by using standard

[1] When we consider a third degree polynomial function the additional parameter C was compatible with 0 at 1σ, $C = 28 \pm 63$.

Table I: A summary of the current constraints on the η_0 parameters from SGL.

Reference	Data Sample	$1+\eta_0 z$	$1+\eta_0 z/(1+z)$
[6]	SGL (SIS) + SNe Ia	$-0.005^{+0.351}_{-0.215}$	-
[5][a]	SGL (SIS) + SNe Ia + ΛCDM	-	0.09 ± 0.3
[5][a]	SGL (PLaw) + SNe Ia + ΛCDM	-	0.06 ± 0.33
[5][b]	SGL (SIS) + SNe Ia + + $\omega(z)$CDM	-	0.017 ± 0.28
[5][b]	SGL (PLaw) + SNe Ia + $\omega(z)$CDM	-	0.0035 ± 0.3
This paper	SGL (PLaw) + SNe Ia + GRB	-0.03 ± 0.05	-0.37 ± 0.32
This paper	SGL (SIS) + SNe Ia + GRB	0.10 ± 0.04	-0.21 ± 0.25

[a]Planck results
[b]WMAP9 results

propagation errors techniques. For the gravitational lensing error one may show that:

$$\sigma_D = D\sqrt{4(\delta\sigma_0)^2 + (1-\gamma)^2(\delta\theta_E)^2}\,, \qquad (11)$$

while for $D_L(z)$ function:

$$\sigma^2_{D_L} = \left(\frac{\partial D_L}{\partial A}\right)^2 \sigma_A^2 + \left(\frac{\partial D_L}{\partial B}\right)^2 \sigma_B^2 + 2\left(\frac{\partial D_L}{\partial A}\frac{\partial D_L}{\partial B}\right) COV(A,B). \qquad (12)$$

Since our $D_L(z)$ comes from a polynomial function, the points η_{0_i} and η_{0_j} are correlated. However, we constructed the covariance matrix and the terms off diagonal are negligible.

Our results for the P1 and P2 functions are plotted in figures (2a) and (2b). The solid blue and dashed black lines correspond to the likelihood distribution functions for the η_0 parameter by using the PLaw and SIS models, respectively. The black solid horizontal lines correspond to 1 and 2 σ (C.L.). The values of η_0 are displayed in Table I along with the results from [5] and [6]. As one may see, differently from previous analyses, our likelihoods depend more strongly on the $\eta(z)$ functions, probably due to the high-z data used in the analysis. For instance, the analysis using the SIS model excludes the CDRR validity in 2σ (C.L.) when P1 is used. On the other hand, using P2 the CDDR validity is verified at 1σ. However, when the PLaw model is considered, the η_0 is compatible with $\eta_0 = 0$ into 1.5σ c.l. regardless of the $\eta(z)$ function used. As commented earlier, since several studies have shown that slopes of density profiles of individual galaxies show a non-negligible scatter from the SIS, we can conclude that our results do not show any indication for deviations from CDDR validity.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In the last few years, the main fundamental hypotheses of the standard cosmology have been tested thanks to the improved precision of cosmological data. One of them is the so-called cosmic distance duality relation involving angular diameter, D_A, and luminosity distances, $D_L(1+z)^{-2}D_A = 1$. This result is theoretically valid for all cosmological models based on the Riemannian geometry, being independent either upon Einstein field equations or the nature of matter.

Nowadays, model-independent tests using exclusively cosmological distances have been restricted up to redshifts $z \approx 1.42$, the maximum z of type Ia supernovae compilations. In this paper, we have proposed a test that consider 118 angular diameter distances of the strong gravitational lens systems in the redshift range $0.075 \leq z \leq 3.60$ [9] and 677 luminosity distances comprising 580 type Ia supernovae from Union2.1 compilation plus 97 gamma-ray bursts with $z > 1.42$. These gamma-ray bursts are from a sample of 162 distance moduli with the redshift range $0.033 < z < 9.3$ from [14]. We have parameterized the luminosity distances of the type Ia supernovae plus gamma-ray bursts with a second degree polynomial ($\chi^2_{red} = 1.16$) and used the following deformed cosmic distance duality relations: $D_L D_A^{-1}(1+z)^{-2} = 1+\eta_0 z$ (P1) and $D_L D_A^{-1}(1+z)^{-2} = 1+\eta_0 z/(1+z)$ (P2) to constrain the allowed interval of η_0.

We have obtained that the CDRR validity verification depends on the assumptions used to describe the lensing systems (see Figs. 2a and 2b). For instance, when the power law model was considered, the η_0 value was compatible with $\eta_0 = 0$ into 1.5σ c.l. regardless of the $\eta(z)$ function used. The simplest model, the singular isothermal sphere model, excludes the CDRR validity in 2σ level for P1. Therefore, since recent studies have shown that slopes of density profiles of individual galaxies show a non-negligible scatter from the singular isothermal sphere model, we may conclude that our results at high redshifts do not indicate any significant deviation from the CDDR.

Acknowledgments

RFLH is supported by INCT-A and CNPq (No. 478524/2013-7;303734/2014-0). VCB is supported

by FAPESP/CAPES agreement under grant number 2014/21098-1. FSL is supported by CAPES. JSA acknowledges support from CNPq and FAPERJ.

[1] I. M. H. Etherington, Phil. Mag., **15**, 761 (1933); reprinted in Gen. Relativ. Gravit., **39**, 1055 (2007)

[2] G.F.R. Ellis, R. Poltis, J.-P. Uzan, A. Weltman, Phys. Rev. D, **87**, 103530 (2013)

[3] A. Avgoustidis, C. Burrage, J. Redondo, L. Verde and R. Jimenez, JCAP, **10**, 024 (2010); A. Avgoustidis, G. Luzzi, C. J. A. P. Martins and A. M. R. V. L. Monteiro, JCAP, **2**, 013 (2012)

[4] B. A. Bassett and M. Kunz, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 101305 (2004); J. P. Uzan, N. Aghanim & Y. Mellier, Phys. Rev. D, **70**, 083533 (2004); R. F. L. Holanda, R. S. Gonçalves and J. S. Alcaniz, JCAP 1206 , 022 (2012) [arXiv:1201.2378]; R. S. Gonçalves, R. F. L. Holanda and J. S. Alcaniz, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **420** , L43 (2012) [arXiv:1109.2790]; Z. Li, P. Wu and W. Yu, Astrophys. J. **729**, L14 (2011); X. Yang et. al., Astrophys. J. Lett. **777**, L24 (2013); R. F. L. Holanda and V. C. Busti, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 103517 (2014) [arXiv:1402.2161] ; G.F.R. Ellis, R. Poltis, J.-P. Uzan and A. Weltman, Phys. Rev. D, **87**, 103530 (2013); S. Santos-da-Costa, V. C. Busti and R. F. L. Holanda, JCAP, **10**, 061 (2015); A. Rana, D. Jain, S. Mahajan and A. Mukherjee, JCAP, **07**, 026 (2016)

[5] R. F. L. Holanda, V. C. Busti and J. S. Alcaniz, JCAP, **02**, 054 (2016)

[6] W. Liao et al., ApJL, **822**, 74 (2016)

[7] Z.H. Zhu, Mod. Phys. Lett. A, **15**, 1023 (2000); K.-H. Chae and S. D. Mao, ApJ, **599**, L61 (2003); J. L. Mitchell, C. R. Keeton, J. A. Frieman and R. K. Sheth, ApJ, **622**, 81 (2005); Z.-H. Zhu and S. Mauro, A&A, **487**, 831 (2008); Z.-H. Zhu et al., A&A, **483**, 15 (2008); K.-H. Chae, G. Chen, B. Ratra and D.-W. Lee, ApJ, **607**, L71 (2004); M. Biesiada, B. Malec and A. Piorkowska, MNRAS, **406**,1055 (2010); C. C. Yuan and F. Y. Wang, MNRAS, **452**, 2423 (2015); E. V. Linder, Phys. Rev. D, **94**, 083510 (2016)

[8] Schneider, P., Kochanek, C. S., & Wambsganss, J. 2006, Gravitational Lensing: Strong, Weak and Micro (Springer)

[9] S. Cao, M. Biesiada, R. Gavazzi, A. Piorkowska and Z. U. Zhu, ApJ, **806**, 185 (2015)

[10] N. Suzuki et al., ApJ, **85**, 746 (2012)

[11] P. A. R. Ade et al., A&A, **594**, A13 (2016)

[12] G. Hinshaw et al., APJS, **208**, 19H (2013)

[13] M. Betoule et. al., A&A, **568**, A22 (2014)

[14] M. Demianski; E. Piedipalumbo; D. Sawant and L. Amati, 2016, arXiv:1610.00854

[15] R. F. L. Holanda, J. A. S. Lima and M. B. Ribeiro, ApJL, **722**, 233 (2010)

[16] M. Bartelmann and P. Schneider, Phys. Rep., **340**, 291 (2001)

[17] L. Koopmans, A. Bolton, T. Treu, O. Czoske, M. Auger, et al., ApJ, **703**, L54 (2009); M. W. Auger, T. Treu, A. S. Bolton, R. Gavazzi, L. V. E. Koopmans, P. J. Marshall, L. A. Moustakas and S. Burles, ApJ, **724** 511 (2010); M. Barnabe, O. Czoske, L. V. E. Koopmans, T. Treu and A. S. Bolton, MNRAS, **415**, 2215 (2011); A. Sonnenfeld, T. Treu, R. Gavazzi, S. H. Suyu, P. J. Marshall, et al., ApJ, **777**, 98 (2013); M. Cappellari et al. 2015 arXiv:1504.0007

[18] E. O. Ofek, H. W. Rix and D. Maoz, MNRAS, **343**, 639 (2003)